



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

savage, and the months required by the undeveloped intelligence of the child. But in all these cases the process is the same. The sophisticated modern, when he gives utterance to perception before it has developed out of the homogeneous stage, is making radical metaphor just as truly as does the savage or the child" (p. 33).

The evolution into plain statement is the third and last step in the development of metaphor. Metaphor when expressed in conscious statement becomes simile. The mind recognizes the likenesses and unlikenesses of two objects, and selects certain characteristics for comparison. The basis of this comparison may be merely one of general resemblance; or it may be limited to a particular quality or characteristic common to both objects, for example, white as chalk. Beyond this there is only one step further, in the development of metaphor—the step to perfectly plain, that is abstract, statement of fact, for example, the cloud is white. This is the final reach of language, and it is only through the metaphor-process that such abstract ideas come into existence.

The chapter on the æsthetics of metaphor bases pleasure in metaphor on the theory that "it incites the reader to reconstruct the mental process by which it came into being" (p. 69). The last chapter, on pathological forms of metaphor, treats of conceit and mixed metaphor.

The study merits a word of special commendation for the perfect clearness and the amplitude with which it is presented. Perhaps the germs of many of the main ideas are to be found in Gerber; but to compare the present orderly statement with Gerber's chaos is to bring out most emphatically the best qualities of the study.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

Teachers College, Columbia Univ.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Goethe's Egmont, together with Schiller's essays *Des Grafen Lamoral von Egmont Leben und Tod* and *Über Egmont, Trauerspiel von Goethe*. Edited with introduction and notes by MAX WINKLER, Ph. D. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1898. 12mo, li, 276 pp.

THIS text-book is designed for advanced stu-

dents of German who wish to study the drama as a classic. Such a plan is in accord with the recommendations of the Committee on Modern Languages, who name Goethe's *Egmont* in their selection of books for the *Advanced Course* in German (see *Report*, section ix c).

It was a happy idea to add to the text of the drama Schiller's essay *Des Grafen Lamoral von Egmont Leben und Tod*, which contains a lifelike portrait of the historical Egmont, a fitting pendant to that of the dramatic hero. Schiller's vivid delineation is a masterpiece of German prose, and in certain scenes, such as the execution of Egmont and Horn, he becomes more effective, by his tragic brevity, than Motley, who occasionally betrays a bias toward fine writing by the use of an unessential adjective or bit of heightened color.

Professor Winkler ably defends Goethe's *Egmont* against the harsh criticism of Schiller, yet the editor gives proof of his fairness by including in his volume the essay *Über Egmont, Trauerspiel von Goethe*, where Schiller presents his views with all the fascination of his clear and vigorous style. With a wider acquaintance and deeper sympathy with the facts of history, Schiller fails to see where Goethe, in spite of his extraordinary license, has ennobled the character of the historical Egmont, or even increased the interest in his subject, which ends alone, Schiller thinks, can justify a poet in disregarding historical truth. Yet is Schiller therefore lacking in appreciation? Is not his so-called narrow view a sound one? Let us but understand him. He has spent his days and nights in the study of that remarkable epoch, the revolt of the Dutch Republic, and he is more deeply impressed by the motivation, the heroism, and the unflinching justice of actual history, than by the beautifully human fiction of Goethe's genius, the *Sturm und Drang Egmont*, who is impelled by the "demonic" element within him to lead the life that he must. In spite of all that can be said in defence of Goethe's tragedy, the fact remains that the historical picture is more effective dramatically. Its truth has more power to purify us through terror and pity than the beauty of the humane life-lover, the popular idol, that Goethe has created. The great poet

has failed in competition with the drama written on Clio's tablets.

The character of Klärchen, like that of Gretchen, does not appeal to all American college students alike, especially where co-education honors the ideal of equality. Nevertheless the type of unintellectual, pure and devoted womanhood has ever strongly attracted the masculine mind, as the lives of men of genius will remind us. Again, where class distinctions are not severe, it is difficult to understand the fascinating power of gentle manners in the man over woman of a lower social station. Gretchen says

"Er sah gewiss recht wacker aus
Und ist aus einem edlen Haus;
Das konnt' ich ihm an der Stirne lesen—
Er wär' auch sonst nicht so keck gewesen."

Points of view gained by the broadening study of *Kulturgeschichte* will frequently weaken prejudices and aid literary appreciation.

Professor Winkler's book is not shy of literary questions, but opens up their very kernel. The notes are within a few pages equal in bulk to those of the Buchheim edition (Clarendon Press, Macmillan and Co.). The common fault of the veteran editor's admirable series of German classics, namely, too frequent translations and annotations, has not been repeated; its place has been taken by copiousness of a different sort, but just as much a blemish. I refer to the length of the historical notes, their detail and encyclopedic character. For an illustration we may take the note to page 10, l. 10 (p. 183). This note, containing more than five hundred words, is written under the name *Oranien*. But is the Prince of Orange alone the subject of the note? No, the League of the *Gueux*, the whole epoch is discussed, matters which are not totally irrelevant, but which would have found a better place in an historical introduction, where the materials of the numerous historical notes might have appeared consecutively. Your average student will not read page after page of notes, he wishes to read the German play. The time at his disposal, after all, is limited, and there is great pressure upon it from many departments of college work.

In the note on *Margarete von Parma*, page

7, l. 19 (p. 179), what are the essential facts? That the regent was the natural daughter of Charles V, that after a first unhappy marriage she became the wife of young Farnese, subsequently Duke of Parma, that she was schooled in Machiavellian politics, a zealous Catholic, disciple of Loyola, a huntress in taste, and masculine in feature (*horribile dictu!* "famous for her moustache"). Yet the editor uses three hundred and fifty words in his note.

Another feature by which the Notes have been needlessly expanded is the introduction, at the end of each scene, of a summary of the action that has gone before, sometimes with critical remarks added. These summaries in a manner take the place of the "arguments" in the Buchheim edition, placed in the body of the text in advance of each act of the play. The announcer who steps before the curtain to increase our expectation ceases to be welcome after his first appearance; but picture to yourself the reception of the bold man who would attempt to repeat and explain all that has just passed! You may say that post-mortems are a necessary part of thorough instruction; very well, then let the student do the work with his own hands and eyes and brain, and ask him questions about it. If you tell him all that he is expected to see, he will close his eyes, repeat what you have told him, and let his hands and brain remain idle.

Teachers will always differ to some extent as to which words or constructions need explanation and which not, but serious omissions are not evident in this carefully prepared edition. Possibly a note would have been helpful at p. 9, l. 23, *herumtummeln*; p. 9, l. 25, *von der Leber weg=frisch* (or *frei*) *von der Leber weg*; p. 21, l. 21, *ich habe Unrecht gegen ihn*; p. 134, l. 12, the construction *jedes Sklave=Sklave eines jeden*, etc. Another interpretation is possible at p. 37, l. 16, of *hielt' ich's besser*, namely: 'I should prefer,' 'I should like it better.' At p. 51, l. 12, *Die Könige thun nichts Niedriges*, the meaning seems to me to be: Kings are incapable of a mean act, in the eyes of the world, because of their exalted position, they are unimpeachable.

At page 59, l. 17, the literal interpretation of *fasst sich selbst in seine Arme* is not 'takes

himself into his own arms' but 'takes hold of his own arms,' the right hand grasping the left arm, and the left hand seizing the right arm; the ultimate meaning is the same, namely: 'to cross the arms' (cf. *unter das Kinn fassen, in den Arm kneifen*).

Professor Winkler's comments on the violent changes which Schiller made in his revision of Goethe's Egmont for the Weimar stage are very properly placed in the Notes just where they are needed. The frequent exact references to standard historical works, the map and bibliography are very convenient and useful. The publishers have furnished the volume with an agreeable variety of type, clear print and a tasteful exterior, but the attractive qualities within are the more worthy of commendation.

A. B. FAUST.

Wesleyan University.

ENGLISCHE TEXTBIBLIOTHEK.

Keats' Hyperion mit Einleitung herausgegeben von JOHANNES HOOPS, Prof. an der Universität Heidelberg. Berlin: Emil Felber, 1899. Pp. xlvii, 103.

THE *Englische Textbibliothek*, now being edited by Prof. Johannes Hoops, of the University of Heidelberg, will present, in neat, critical editions, the important works of English literature, and more especially, the poetic masterpieces that have appeared since the sixteenth century. Among the contributors are numbered almost all the leading instructors of English in the German universities.

Prof. Hoops' edition of Keats' *Hyperion* forms the third number of the series. In the first chapter of his Introduction, may be found all desirable information in regard to the composition of the poem. Keats seems to have gone earnestly to work on *Hyperion* in Dec., 1818, shortly after the death of his brother Tom. "It was then he wrote *Hyperion*," says Brown, the friend with whom Keats was then living. It must have been finished by April, 1819, since the transcript made at that time by Woodhouse contains nearly the same number of lines that one finds in the piece as published in 1820. It

has come down to us a fragment. Keats, the poet of *Isabella*, the *Eve of St. Agnes*, the *Eve of St. Mark*, and *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, had cooled, as time went on, in his admiration for Milton. Writing to Reynolds in Sept., 1819, he says:

"I have given up *Hyperion*—there were too many Miltonic inversions in it—Miltonic verse cannot be written but in an artful, or, rather, artist's humour."¹

Again, in a letter to his brother George, he writes:

"The *Paradise Lost*, though so fine in itself, is a corruption of language. It should be kept as it is, unique, a curiosity, a beautiful and grand curiosity, the most remarkable production of the world; a northern dialect accommodating itself to Greek and Latin inversions and intonations. The purest English, I think—or what ought to be the purest—is Chatterton's . . . I prefer the native music of it to Milton's, cut by feet. I have but lately stood on my guard against Milton. Life to him would be death to me. Miltonic verse cannot be written, but is the verse of art. I wish to devote myself to another verse alone."²

It is clear that Keats labored in *Hyperion* under the oppressive feeling of conscious imitation of *Paradise Lost*.

The second chapter of the Introduction is given to a *résumé* of the best criticism that has been made on the poem. It may suffice to note here that the editor agrees with the majority of Keats' critics in considering *Hyperion* one of the grandest creations of modern English poetry. At the same time, it should not be overlooked that the poet himself was little pleased with the work; and that his romantic masterpieces, such as the *Eve of St. Agnes*, and *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, have left far deeper traces on Victorian literature than has the epic fragment.

The editor next takes up (cap. iii) the historic position of the work in English literature. While the influence of Spenser (so important

¹ *The Letters of John Keats*, Ed. by H. Buxton Forman. London: Reeves & Turner, 1895, p. 380.

² *Ibid.*, p. 478 ff.

³ Cf. here Mr. W. T. Arnold's interesting remarks in the introduction of his edition: *The Poetical Works of John Keats*, ed. by William T. Arnold. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1888.